

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-26 are pending in the present application. With this amendment claims 1-5, 8-13, 16-23 and 25-26 were amended, and claims 6 and 7 were canceled. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants have amended the specification to remove language regarding transmission-type media.

### **I. Interview**

Applicants appreciate greatly the courtesies extended by the Examiner during the interview that was held on August 16, 2006. Applicants' claims were discussed. No agreement was reached regarding the patentability of Applicants' claims.

### **II. 35 U.S.C. § 101**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed towards non-statutory subject matter, specifically stating that the claims are not directed towards a final result that is useful, tangible, and concrete.

Applicants have amended the claims to describe a final result that is useful, tangible, and concrete. For example, the independent claims now recite the creation of a second repository and the transformation of the storage. Therefore, this rejection is believed to be overcome by the amendments to the claims and should be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claims 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed towards non-statutory subject matter, specifically stating that the claims recited "computer readable medium". Claims 17-20 do not recite computer readable medium; however, claims 20-26 do. Applicants have amended claims 20-26 to recite "computer readable storage medium". Therefore, this rejection is believed to be overcome by the amendments to the claims and should be withdrawn.

### **III. 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), Anticipation**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Goodman et al.*, Architectures for Netcentric Computing Systems, U.S. Patent No. 2006/0059253, March 16, 2006 (hereinafter *Goodman*). This rejection, as it might be applied to the claims as amended, is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended the independent claims to recite a common information model (CIM) server computer system that includes storage and a common management model object manager

(CIMOM) processing environment that includes an internal repository. Method calls to the storage are executed by methods that are currently stored in the storage. An existing set of methods are currently stored in the storage. The existing set of methods manipulates first objects that are included in the internal repository. Because the existing set of methods is currently stored in the storage, current method calls to the storage manipulate first objects that are stored in the internal repository.

A second repository is created. The second repository is external to the CIMOM processing environment. The second repository includes second objects representing components for a logically partitioned data processing system. The objects are grouped by class into a set of classes. Associations between the objects are links within the second repository.

The second objects are manipulated using a second set of methods. The storage is transformed by overwriting the existing set of methods in the storage with the second set of methods.

A request is received from a requestor that includes a method call to the storage. One of the second set of methods is executed causing one of the second objects to be manipulated. Method calls to the storage now manipulate the second objects instead of the first objects.

Some examples of support for these amendments can be found in Figure 3 and its related text, and in the specification on page 10, lines 5-10, page 12, lines 5-12, and page 12 line 28, through page 30, line 4.

*Goodman* does not teach a common information model (CIM) server computer system. Regarding claim 3, which claims a common information model (CIM) standard, the Examiner refers to paragraphs 0503 and 0335 asserting that Applicants' claimed features are taught in these paragraphs. Neither paragraph 0503 nor paragraph 0335 teaches a CIM standard. Applicants do not find a reference to a common information model (CIM) anywhere in *Goodman*.

*Goodman* does not teach a common information model object manager (CIMOM). *Goodman* does not teach a second repository that is external to the CIMOM. *Goodman* does not teach overwriting an existing set of methods that are stored in the storage with a second set of methods. *Goodman* does not teach executing one of the second set of methods causing one of the second objects in the second repository to be manipulated, wherein method calls to the storage manipulate the second objects instead of the first objects in the internal repository.

Because *Goodman* does not teach all of the features of Applicants' independent claims, *Goodman* does not anticipate Applicants' independent claims.

Since the remaining claims depend from the independent claims discussed above, the same distinctions exist between *Goodman* and the dependent claims. Consequently, it is respectfully urged that the rejection of Applicants' claims has been overcome.

IV. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over *Goodman* and is now in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: August 28, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

/Lisa L.B. Yociss/

Lisa L.B. Yociss  
Reg. No. 36,975  
Yee & Associates, P.C.  
P.O. Box 802333  
Dallas, TX 75380  
(972) 385-8777  
Attorney for Applicants